

REMARKS

In the Office Action of July 25, 2008, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-12, 14-21 and 23-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,396,612 B1 (“Bjorndahl”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,277,420 B2 (“Chou et al.”). In addition, claims 3, 6, 13 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bjorndahl and Chou et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0186846 A1 (“Nyberg et al.”) or U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0007641 A1 (“Kinoshita”).

In response, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 11 and 20 to correct minor informalities. Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 1, 11 and 20 are not obvious in view of Bjorndahl and Chou et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims 1-29 be allowed.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 11 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel, the interfaces including at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, and a wireless large area network interface,*” which is not disclosed in the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al., and request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The latest Office Action correctly states on page 4 that the cited reference of Bjorndahl “doesn’t teach specifically, wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel, the interfaces including at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, a wireless large area network interface.” However, the Office Action then apparently alleges that the cited reference of Chou et al. discloses the limitations of “wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for

communication over the first communication channel, the interfaces including at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, a wireless large area network interface. (Col.6; 61-Col.7; 1).”

5 The cited reference of Chou et al. describes in the paragraph beginning at column 6, line 49, the electrical components of a wireless headset that includes a WLAN transceiving integrated circuit 300, which is illustrated in Fig. 3A. In particular, Chou et al. discloses in column 6, lines 61-67, that the WLAN transceiving integrated circuit 300 includes a plurality of interfaces. However, these interfaces are
10 interfaces between the WLAN transceiving integrated circuit 300 and other electrical components of the wireless headset, such as the EEPROM 309 and the CODEC 314. Thus, the interfaces described in Chou et al. are not *“interfaces configured for communication over the first communication channel,”* as recited in the amended independent claim 1. The *“first communication channel”* is the channel used for
15 *“communication between the one communication partner device and the other communication partner device.”* Furthermore, the cited passage of Chou et al. does not disclose a Bluetooth interface or an infra-red light interface. Thus, the cited reference of Chou et al. fails to disclose *“wherein the electrical circuit includes a plurality of interfaces configured for communication over the first communication
20 channel, the interfaces including at least two of a Bluetooth interface, an infra-red light interface, and a wireless large area network interface,”* as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

25 The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 11 and 20, which recite limitations that are similar to those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 are also not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al., and request that the amended independent claims 11 and 20 be allowed as well.
30

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 12-19 and 21-29 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 11 and 20. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

As an example, the dependent claim 7 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device for communication over the first communication channel.*” The latest Office Action on page 6 alleges that the cited reference of Chou et al. discloses “wherein the communication enable information item contains an interface type information item which indicates the interfaces that are available in the communication partner device for communication over the first communication channel. [Col.6,61-Col.7-1]” However, the cited passage of Chou et al. does not mention any interface type information item contained in a communication enable information item (which was equated to an encryption key in Bjorndahl) which indicates the interfaces that are available in the wireless headset for communication over a communication channel. Consequently, the cited reference of Chou et al. does not disclose these limitations of the dependent claim 7. Thus, the dependent claim 7 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al.

As another example, the dependent claim 8 recites the limitations of “*wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item.*” The latest Office Action on page 6 alleges that the cited reference of Chou et al. discloses “wherein the communication enable information item contains, in addition to the interface type information item, an interface preference information item which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the communication partner device containing the communication enable information item. [Col.6,61-Col.7-1]” However, the cited passage of Chou et al. does

not mention any interface preference information item contained in a communication enable information item (which was equated to an encryption key in Bjorndahl) which signifies one of the interfaces that is preferred in the wireless headset containing the communication enable information item. Consequently, the cited reference of Chou et al. does not disclose these limitations of the dependent claim 8. Thus, the dependent claim 8 is not obvious in view of the cited references of Bjorndahl and Chou et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Harnisch et al.

Date: October 27, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300